2003 Transportation Summit Planning Team

Experts Comment on

LAND USE

LAND USE
September 15, 2003
8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
Secondary Center, Lake Michigan Conference Room, Lansing, MI

AGENDA

WELCOME
Facilitator: Kirk Steudle, MDOT Chief Deputy Director

Discussion Moderator:
Susan Mortel, Bureau Director, MDOT Transportation Planning

EXPERTS SPEAKING ON THE ISSUES

Regional Growth: Choices for Our Future

Jon Coleman, Executive Director
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission

Land Use & Transportation Issues in the Tri-County Region: What Do Consumers Want?

John Cavanaugh, Co-Owner EPIC-MRA

Perspectives on a Variety of Statewide Transportation / Land Use Decisions

Mark Wycoff, FAICP, President Planning &
Zoning Center, Inc.

The Transportation Land Use Link: The Smart Growth Alternative

Bradley Strader, Partner in Charge
Langworthy, Strader LeBLanc & Associates,
Planners

Land Use / Transportation Issues in Industrial Development Decision Making

Ray Tadgerson, President and CEO,
Capital Consultants, Inc.

Transportation's Impact on the Michigan Land Use Leadership Council

Hans Voss, Executive Director
Michigan Land Use Institute

PLANNING ITEMS

Planning Team's Comments on the Issues

Drafting the Issues, Goals and Action Plans

Tri-County Regional Growth: Choices for our Future
Expert Speaker: **Jon Coleman, Executive Director Tri-County Regional Planning Commission**

Project Overview	Tri-County Regional Planning Commission has been working on Regional Growth project for the last four years.
	
	 • There are 75 units of government (jurisdictions) within the three counties of Ingham, Eaton and Clinton
	 • Hoping for one future vision for land use
	 • There are 14 regional planning commissions around the state
	 • The Tri-County Regional Planning Commission also works on economic growth planning and environmental planning issues
	     – They have a Regional Data Center (mapping for public and private sector)
	     – Their board consists of 19 members
	     – Six of the 19 board members are transportation providers

Mission Statement	It shall be the mission of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission's "Regional Growth: Choices for the Future" Project **to actively engage the citizens of the region to examine implications of regional land use and other growth trends on the region's future** and to formulate consensus on a shared vision of regional growth in order to assure improved and future regional quality of life and economic competitiveness for our citizens and businesses. • It is important that the citizens of the region are engaged in this project. • Need to develop a shared vision on how the region should grow between the tri-counties.
Tri-County Region	Central cities of the tri-counties are Lansing and East Lansing. • There is a great deal of agriculture land in the tri-county region. • Tri-county region is fragmented.
Structure of Power	• 78 local units of government. • 50 units with land use power. • 2 counties, 22 townships, 26 cities and villages.
Six Principle Activities	1. Collect and objectively evaluate regional land use and other growth trend information. 2. Actively engage local governments, citizens and stakeholder groups in examining implications of these trends on the region's future. 3. Identify and evaluate alternatives to these trends, as appropriate. 4. Formulate consensus on a shared regional vision about a preferred alternative.

5. Develop tools, techniques and action strategies to implement the shared vision and preferred alternative.
6. Establish a regional process for monitoring and evaluating success at implementing these strategies:
   - Have a system in place to monitor how they are doing.
   - Have implemented indicators to measure over time.
   - Have a set game plan.

Regional Growth Choices for Our Future	**7 Steps:** **1. Visioning** **2. Inventory existing conditions** **3. Develop goals and objectives** **4. Develop alternatives** **5. Analyze alternatives** **6. Develop action plan** **7. Adopt action plan and update 2025 Regional Transportation Plan** Several thousand people involved in the process. Key issues : - Structure of stakeholders - Broke down processes and committees - Took a team approach from the beginning to do the project - Electronic voting mechanism at the forums which resulted in immediate and anonymous responses - All information was captured on the computer - There was strong support from Michigan State University Extension staff for facilitating meetings and breakout groups along with support from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) staff - Had higher participation from rural citizens
Regional Population	Plotting a graph of regional population from 1950 to 2000 with projections to 2030, shows: - Lansing region grew fast in the 50's, 60's and 70's; 80's was a slow economic period for Michigan. - Lansing has a slow rate of growth compared to other urban areas.
Persons Per Household (HH)	Plotting a graph of persons per household in the tri-county region from 1950-2000 shows a decline in number of people per household.
Population Change, 1970-2000	The trend is that urban areas such as Lansing show a decline in population – while rural areas are growing.

Tri-County Building Permits Issued	Another trend is that rural areas are issuing more building permits than are urban areas.
Agricultural Change, 1978-1999	There has also been a significant loss of acreage for agricultural use. If we think of it in this way: 36 square miles equals a township, then the Tri-County area has lost more than "3 townships" of agriculture land in the last 20 years.
Residential Changes, 1978-1999	Slide showing gain of acreage for residential use. Gain of 104 residential acres for the region. The trend toward more urbanized areas has risen steadily over the past 20 years.
Urban Areas, 1978-1999	Mapping the growth of urban areas from 1978-1999, we see that: • Urban areas have increased in size by approximately 75 acres, from 1938 to 1978. • Urban areas have doubled in size from 1978 to 1999.
Visions, Goals and Objectives: Vision Areas	**These are our 7 vision areas:** **1. Natural Resources** **2. Wise Growth** **3. Quality of Life** **4. Regional Approach** **5. Parks and Recreation** **6. Economic Development** 7. **Public Participation**
Comparing Alternatives	1. Build-out (Assumes no significant change in existing zoning) 2. Trend (Business as Usual) 3. Alternative (Wise Growth) 4. Alternative (Wise Growth) using Build-out data • Went through alternatives and used a land-use model with certain criteria to assign land use types to the map • Build-out consuming huge amounts of agriculture land • Built models with constraints in them – used existing infrastructure wherever possible • Build-out model gave about 1.5 million

End of Year Population / End of Year Households	Build-Out and Wise Growth (Build-Out) – 1,462,666 Persons Trends and Wise Growth (Trends) – 550, 166 Persons Build-Out and Wise Growth (Build-Out) – 446,231 Households Trends and Wise Growth (Trends) – 228,655 Households Number of Households had approximately doubled.
8 Elements of Evaluation	1. **Community Services** 2. **Environment** 3. **Environmental Justice** 4. **Utilities** 5. **Cost of Public Service** 6. **Transportation** 7. **Land Use** 8. **Quality of Life** Last forum was in May 2002, where we examined data for wise growth and business as usual. 79% said wise growth was the way to go; however, it is not necessarily the most cost effective.
Regional Growth: Choices For Our Future	Integrating the "Regional Growth: Choices For Our Future" Project in the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission's Regional 2025 Transportation Plan with Linking Land Use and Transportation (A national best practice cited by FHWA, FTA and others in progress).
Regional Vision / Regional Vision 2025, Preferred Alternative	(Slide of map of Regional Vision for 2025)
Q & A	Q: What's the end year in your proposal? A: The end year for the Wise Growth is 25 years. Determining when the land is used up in that area, how much land was actually zoned for certain development in a community. Q: If one does a combination of Build-Out and Wise Growth, given a population of 1.4M, doesn't Build-Out assume a more aggressive posture than the trends would indicate? A: Yes. What's not clear is that communities are approving zoning that is not consistent with zoning population trends. Most communities, when zoning, do not take into consideration what's going to occur over the next 25 years.

They do "in-state" planning and often zone larger areas than is actually needed; most communities are way over-zoned for what their current needs are.

Q: One thing we have experienced is the competition of local government for the same growth. How do you see that affecting transportation?
A: We would need to approach this from the land use side first.

Q: Did the project also look at the degree of density, that is, a large population over a wide area of space; and, was that a smaller number then?
A: Yes, we did look at it in terms of alternatives. We compared the more dense and the more sprawling. Counter intuitively, however, that seemed to increase the costs, in terms of level of service. Looking at the Build-Out and the Wise Growth Build-Out, there's no comparison. Wise- growth beats the others hands-down, in terms of costs, services, air quality, transportation services, etc. This analysis is in our report as well as recommendations for these growth issues and the roles for regional planning personnel.

Land Use & Transportation Issues in the Tri-County Region: What Do Consumers Want?

Expert Speaker: **John Cavanaugh, Co-Owner EPIC-MRA**

General Population Survey Ranked by Total Importance

Thinking again about the reasons why you may have decided to live in (COMMUNITY NAMED IN Q. 02), I would like to read several brief statements to you. After each one, please tell me if that statement describes something that was a very important factor, a somewhat important factor, only a minor factor, or not a factor at all in your decision to live where you do? [ROTATE Qs 16 TO 32a]

	very	*somewhat*	*Total*
- safety from crime	49%	17%	66%
- to live in a place that is quiet	32%	23%	55%
- the availability and quality of affordable housing	26%	23%	49%
- less traffic congestion	24%	24%	48%
- access to stores & services	18%	29%	47%
- to be closer to work	26%	18%	44%
- the quality of local schools	32%	11%	43%
- the quality of local services,			
- such as police and fire protection	22%	21%	43%
- having paved roads	24%	18%	42%
- to have a larger yard	18%	19%	37%
- to have more open space	22%	14%	36%
- to be closer to family	18%	17%	35%
- having public sewer services	19%	15%	34%
- a lower cost of living	12%	22%	34%
- to live in an area where you can walk to nearby stores and other places	14%	17%	31%
- to be close to parks and recreation facilities	12%	18%	30%
- to live in an area where there is a mix of people of different races	10%	19%	29%
- because of a change in jobs	19%	5%	24%
- historic charm of the community	8%	16%	24%
- the amount of local taxes	8%	14%	22%
- to be close to public transportation	7%	10%	17%
- to have a smaller yard	4%	4%	8%
- to live an area that is NOT as racially mixed as other areas	2%	7%	7%

General Population Survey Ranked by 9-10 Ratings

Now, I am going to read a list of concerns to you that are often related to land use issues. Using a scale of zero to 10, with zero meaning not a problem at all and 10 meaning an extremely serious problem, please tell me how you would rate each of the following problems in the region. [READ & ROTATE Qs 43-61 BELOW-IF UNDECIDED, CODE 99]

	Ratings	
	9-10	*0-4*
- loss of farmland	26%	30%
- the need to improve roads and schools in older communities in the region	26%	32%
- loss of forest land	25%	37%
- loss of nature wildlife habitats	25%	25%
- loss of open space	23%	31%
- traffic problems and congestion	22%	39%
- the quality of education	22%	49%
- water pollution	21%	41%
- air pollution	21%	43%
- loss of land used for leisure activities	17%	46%
- lack of coordinated land use planning and zoning between adjacent jurisdictions	17%	44%
- the cost of building new infra-structure services like roads and utilities to serve new development	16%	38%
- too much residential growth and development	16%	45%
- too much commercial or industrial growth and development	16%	51%
- urban sprawl	16%	44%
- the need to improve roads and schools in newer communities in the region	15%	54%
- the unpredictability of local zoning decisions	15%	49%
- the need for economic growth in the region	13%	44%
- inadequate water or sewage systems	12%	67%
- too much time spent traveling to and from work	9%	70%

General Population Survey Ranked by Total Importance

Thinking again about the reasons why you may move in the future, now I would like to read you some of the reasons people look for a new house or a new community. For each reason I read, please tell me if that reason will be a very important factor, a somewhat important factor, only a minor factor, or not a factor at all in your decision in the future to move. [ROTATE Qs 74 TO 89]

	very	*somewhat*	*Total*
- to have quality local services like police and fire	41%	18%	59%
- more open space	34%	25%	59%
- a quieter area to live	33%	26%	59%
- lower taxes	30%	28%	58%
- less traffic congestion	28%	24%	52%
- greater safety from crime	38%	13%	51%
- a more affordable house	36%	15%	51%
- better neighborhood appearance	24%	23%	47%
- to be closer to work	27%	18%	45%
- higher resale value	27%	18%	45%
- to have better schools	30%	12%	42%
- to have a larger yard	28%	13%	41%
- having public sewer services	29%	11%	40%
- to have a larger house	28%	11%	39%
- more access to stores and services	16%	22%	38%
- to be on a paved road	16%	13%	29%
- to be close to public transportation	12%	11%	23%

General Population Survey Ranked by Total Importance

I would like to read a list of land use goals being discussed for the Tri-County Region. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think it should be a top priority, if important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or no a priority at all? This first one is…
[ROTATE Qs 100 TO 113]

	top	*important*	*Total*
- protecting groundwater, lakes and streams from contamination	81%	14%	95%
- cleaning up and restoring polluted rivers, lakes and streams, landfills, and industrial sites	76%	17%	93%
- protecting wildlife habitats & wetlands	63%	25%	88%
- preserving as much green space as possible as more commercial and residential development occurs	47%	32%	79%
- encouraging the reuse and redevelopment of older urban lands	47%	30%	77%
- preserving wetlands	45%	21%	76%
- providing better planning of industrial, commercial, and residential developments	43%	32%	75%
- preventing the loss of farmland in the region	46%	28%	74%
- promoting greater cooperation in land use planning among local, county, and regional levels of government.	44%	30%	74%
- keeping as much opens space as possible	41%	33%	74%
- improving and expanding parks and recreational facilities	37%	37%	74%
- providing walking and biking path greenways	34%	33%	67%
- encouraging the creation and expansion of businesses and industries	21%	33%	54%
- promoting tourism and convention business in the area	21%	28%	49%

General Population Survey Ranked by Total Priority

Now, I would like to read you a list of transportation goals. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think that goal should be a top priority, important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or not a priority at all? The first one is… [ROTATE Qs 114 TO 124]

	top	_important_	_Total_
- maintaining mobility for low income and elderly citizens	56%	30%	86%
- repairing and maintaining roads and bridges	56%	30%	86%
- reducing congestion and improving traffic flow through major streets and intersections	39%	33%	72%
- improving sidewalks and pathways for pedestrians and bicycles	31%	33%	64%
- providing adequate parking for commuters and for shoppers	26%	33%	59%
- improving public transportation services	30%	25%	59%
- improving options for carpooling and vanpooling	22%	29%	51%
- providing passenger rail service to other communities	21%	24%	45%
- making airport improvements	20%	23%	43%
- paving gravel roads	17%	25%	43%
- building new roads	17%	24%	41%
- widening existing roads	15%	23%	38%

General Population Survey Ranked by TOP Priority

Now, I would like to read you a list of transportation goals. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think that goal should be a top priority, important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or not a priority at all. [ROTATE Qs 114 TO 124]

	top	_important_	_Total_
- maintaining mobility for low income and elderly citizens	56%	30%	86%
- repairing and maintaining roads and bridges	56%	30%	86%
- reducing congestion and improving traffic flow through major streets and intersections	39%	33%	72%
- improving sidewalks and pathways for pedestrians and bicycles	31%	33%	64%
- improving public transportation services	30%	25%	59%
- providing adequate parking for commuters and for shoppers	26%	33%	59%
- improving options for carpooling and vanpooling	22%	29%	51%
- providing passenger rail service to other communities	21%	24%	45%
- making airport improvements	20%	23%	43%
- paving gravel roads	17%	25%	43%
- building new roads	17%	24%	41%
- widening existing roads	15%	23%	38%

**Leaders'
Survey
Ranked by
9-10
Ratings**

Now, I am going to read a list of concerns to you that are often related to land use issues. Using a scale of zero to 10, with zero meaning not a problem at all and 10 meaning an extremely serious problem, please tell me how you would rate each of the following problems in the region. [READ & ROTATE Qs 10-19 BELOW-IF UNDECIDED, CODE 99]

	Ratings	
	9-10	*0-4*
- loss of farmland	31%	26%
- lack of coordinated land use planning and zoning between adjacent jurisdictions	30%	25%
- urban sprawl	29%	27%
- the need to improve roads and schools in <u>older</u> communities in the region	24%	20%
- loss of open space	23%	27%
- the cost of building new infra-structure services like roads and utilities to serve new developments	22%	20%
- loss of nature wildlife habitats	18%	31%
- loss of forest land	15%	39%
- traffic problems and congestion	14%	31%
- the quality of education	13%	48%
- too much residential growth and development	13%	46%
- the unpredictability of local zoning decisions	11%	46%
- the need for economic growth in the region	10%	34%
- water pollution	9%	42%
- inadequate water or sewage systems	8%	54%
- too much commercial or industrial growth and development	6%	62%
- loss of land used for leisure activities	5%	55%
- air pollution	4%	55%
- the need to improve roads and schools in <u>newer</u> communities in the region	4%	54%
- too much time spent traveling to and from work	4%	76%

Leaders' Survey Ranked by Total Importance

I would like to read a list of about a dozen different land use goals being discussed for the Tri-County Region. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think it should be a top priority, if you think it's important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or not a priority at all? This first one is… [ROTATE Qs 41 TO 53]

	top	*important*	*Total*
- cleaning up and restoring polluted rivers, lakes and streams, landfills, and industrial sites	55%	44%	95%
- protecting groundwater, lakes and streams from contamination	64%	30%	94%
- encouraging the reuse and redevelopment of older urban lands	57%	35%	92%
- promoting greater cooperation in land use planning among local, county, and regional levels of government.	51%	40%	91%
- providing better planning of industrial, commercial, and residential developments	43%	47%	90%
- preserving as much green space as possible as more commercial and residential development occurs	39%	44%	83%
- keeping as much opens space as possible	32%	44%	76%
- protecting wildlife habitats & wetlands	33%	42%	75%
- preventing the loss of farmland in the region	38%	36%	74%
- encouraging the creation and expansion of businesses and industries	19%	42%	61%
- improving and expanding parks and recreational facilities	17%	43%	60%
- providing walking and biking path greenways	22%	36%	58%
- promoting tourism and convention business in the area	11%	35%	46%

**Leaders'
Survey
Ranked by
Total
Importance**

Now, I would like to read you a list of several transportation goals. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think that goal should be a top priority, important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or not a priority at all? The first one is… [ROTATE Qs 54 TO 65]

	top	*important*	*Total*
- repairing and maintaining roads and bridges	47%	45%	92%
- reducing congestion and improving traffic flow through major streets and intersections	30%	49%	79%
- maintaining mobility for low income and elderly citizens	22%	52%	74%
- improving sidewalks and pathways for pedestrians and bicycles	22%	38%	60%
- improving bus and other public transportation services	19%	36%	55%
- providing adequate parking for commuters and for shoppers	11%	41%	52%
- improving options for carpooling and vanpooling	14%	37%	51%
- making airport improvements	9%	31%	40%
- providing passenger rail service to other communities	13%	25%	38%
- paving gravel roads	9%	19%	28%
- building new roads	4%	22%	26%
- widening existing roads	6%	18%	24%

<u>Leadership</u> – Oct./Nov. 2001 – 258 SAMPLE – ERROR ± 6.2%
<u>Populace</u> – May 2001 – 420 SAMPLE – ERROR ± 4.9%

Now, I am going to read a list of concerns to you that are often related to land use issues. Using a scale of zero to 10, with zero meaning not a problem at all and 10 meaning an extremely serious problem, please tell me how you would rate each of the following problems in the region. [READ & ROTATE Qs 10-19 BELOW – IF UNDECIDED, CODE 99]

Ranking of:	Leadership		Populace	
	<u>0-4</u>	<u>9-10</u>	<u>9-10</u>	<u>0-4</u>
- loss of farmland	26%	31%	26%	28%
- lack of coordinated land use planning and zoning between adjacent jurisdictions	25%	30%	15%	39%
- urban sprawl	27%	29%	16%	42%
- the need to improve roads and schools in <u>older</u> communities in the region	20%	24%	21%	32%
- loss of open space	27%	23%	22%	30%
- the cost of building new infra-structure services like roads and utilities to serve new development	20%	22%	15%	36%
- loss of natural wildlife habitats	31%	18%	24%	34%
- loss of forest land	39%	15%	24%	37%
- traffic problems and congestion	31%	14%	22%	40%
- too much residential growth and development	46%	13%	17%	43%
- the quality of education	48%	13%	21%	47%
- the unpredictability of local zoning decisions	46%	11%	15%	46%
- the need for economic growth in the region	34%	10%	12%	42%
- water pollution	42%	9%	20%	40%
- inadequate water or sewage systems	54%	8%	11%	66%
- too much commercial or industrial growth and development	62%	6%	16%	50%
- loss of land used for leisure activities	55%	5%	17%	43%
- too much time spent traveling to and from work	76%	4%	8%	67%
- air pollution	55%	4%	20%	43%
- the need to improve roads and schools in <u>newer</u> communities in the region	54%	4%	14%	52%

EPIC-MRA Tri-County Survey, *Continued*

Now, I would like to read you a list of several transportation goals. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think that it should be a top priority, if you think it's important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or not a priority at all? The first one is…

	Leadership		Populace	
	Top	Total	Top	Total
- cleaning up and restoring polluted rivers, lakes, streams, landfills, and industrial sites	55%	95%	76%	93%
- protecting groundwater, lakes and streams from contamination	64%	94%	81%	95%
- encouraging the reuse and redevelopment of older urban lands	57%	92%	47%	77%
- promoting greater cooperation in land use planning among local, county, and regional levels of government	51%	91%	44%	74%
- providing better planning of industrial, commercial, and residential developments	43%	90%	43%	75%
- preserving as much green space as possible as more commercial and residential development occurs.	39%	83%	47%	79%
- keeping as much open space as possible	32%	76%	41%	74%
- protecting wildlife habitats and wetlands	33%	75%	63%	88%
- preventing the loss of farmland in the region	38%	74%	46%	74%
- encouraging the creation and expansion of businesses and industries	19%	61%	21%	54%
- improving and expanding parks and recreational facilities	17%	60%	37%	74%
- providing walking and biking path greenways	22%	58%	34%	67%
- promoting tourism and convention business in the area	11%	46%	21%	49%

Now, I would like to read you a list of several transportation goals. For each one that I read, please tell me if you think that it should be a top priority, if you think it's important but not a top priority, only slightly important, or not a priority at all? The first one is…

	Leadership		Populace	
	Top	Total	Top	Total
- repairing and maintaining roads and bridges	47%	92%	56%	86%
- reducing congestion and improving traffic flow through major streets and intersections	30%	79%	39%	72%
- maintaining mobility for low income and elderly citizens	22%	74%	56%	86%
- improving sidewalks and pathways for pedestrians and bicycles	22%	60%	31%	64%
- improving bus and other public transportation services	19%	55%	30%	55%
- providing adequate parking for commuters and for shoppers	11%	52%	26%	59%
- improving options for carpooling and vanpooling	14%	51%	22%	51%
- making airport improvements	9%	40%	20%	43%
- providing passenger rail service to other communities	13%	38%	2%	45%
- paving gravel roads	9%	28%	17%	43%
- building new roads	4%	26%	17%	41%
- widening existing roads	6%	24%	15%	39%

General Statements We can Make About the Data	• leaders participated from every jurisdiction – good representation
	• sampling technique used voter registration from 5 years ago – further refined with screening techniques
	• the long and short of it was, in this general population survey, that "people live pretty much where they want to live and just deal with the tradeoffs" (commute, etc.)
	• the public is aware of the costs / tradeoffs that result from where they choose to live
	• local schools ranked high, as a reason to live in a certain location but not as high as we expected
	• we were surprised that the public ranked so highly questions related to concerns about land issues
	• the public seemed to express that they did not feel they were being forced to live in places where they preferred not to live
	• loss of farmland and desire to improve older areas are top concerns
	• rural areas ranks expansion as higher
	• urban areas ranks higher in concern for improving their older areas and schools
	• reasons for 'moving' or choice of living location was 1) more open space and 2) quality of services available
	• some irony: urban areas said there seemed to be too much planning going on, although what they expressed as their needs requires a great deal of planning
	• there seems to be a need for educational efforts on the part of planners to inform the public of what 'planning is and does' for them
	• interesting that leaders don't rank environmental concerns as high as the general populace (same order but not as high)
	• interesting that encouraging and creating expansion of business and tourism ranked low
	• priority given to paving roads ('fix what we have')
	• very altruistic high priority to maintain mobility for low income and elderly citizens
	• building and widening roads are lower priority
	• those who have moved to the country – level of taxation concerns – move to find a place with lower taxes
	• rank of order is in keeping with the above sentiments (fix what you have – not build new and raise taxes)
	• leader's survey – difference is in intensity – significantly lower than the general population – pretty much ranked in the same order
	• perspective regarding transportation – leadership seems to be nearly same as general public in the survey (see slide for comparison of general public vs. leadership survey)
	Overall, it seems to be a relatively content population whose leaders pretty much think the same as the public.

Q & A   Q: How reflective of the entire state of Michigan is the data we collect?
A: The general populace in the survey is highly representative of the Tri-County region but we cannot extend these findings to, say, Southeastern Michigan's population, for example. Our 400+ sample population in this survey falls short of African American representation, as well as a variety of other important ethnic groups. We added to this survey an additional 20% ethnic population surveyed, to the tri-county area can be fairly more representative of the state was a whole.

Q: Have you conducted similar surveys for other regions in Michigan and if so, what were the results?
A: Not yet. Nothing of this scale. We would have loved to do so, but the budget simply wasn't there. This is a fascinating tool for leaders to use in the revitalization planning for urban areas, decision making in the support of mileages or the purchasing of farmland.

Q: I don't have a question so much as a comment. I am not surprised at the low number of people for whom transportation is of such low concern; however, I am surprised at the fact that concern for mobility factored so high. This is a strong selling point for transportation to use, as it seems to be supported by the public.

Q: Survey data shows a high percentage and priority on maintain mobility for low income & elderly (public transportation) yet a low percentage of concern is shown for public transportation for where they moved. What sort of reconciliation is this? Has this been studied?

A: Ranking of public trans is one component of a community that makes it worth living in – whether you want it for yourself is irrelevant. You may not need it but you recognize the public needs it. The average commute is no longer than 15 minutes. We didn't pose this as a follow up survey. However, the survey indicates that folks view public transportation as necessary for a decent community and are willing to pay for it

Perspectives on a Variety of Statewide Transportation / Land Use Issues
Expert Speaker: **Mark A. Wyckoff, FAICP President Planning and Zoning Center, Inc.**

Topics to Address	• Secondary and cumulative impacts (urban sprawl, environmental impacts) • Balancing "ease of travel" with preservation and "preferred land uses" • Protecting and enhancing community character, landscapes and the environment • Fully utilizing existing transportation corridors before looking to new (remove barriers, advance planning, all forms of transportation) • Emerging trend and potential long-term impact of private roads vs. public roads • Statewide transportation costs of urban sprawl

---

What is Sprawl?	Sprawl = the decentralization of population *"Sprawl is a low density land use pattern that is automobile dependent, energy and land consumptive, and requires a very high ratio of road surface to development served."* (MSPO, Patterns on the Land, 1995)

Compact Development	What Michigan Communities Used to be Like & What Michigan Communities are Rapidly Becoming- • In Michigan, strong suburban growth during the 1990s contrasts with particularly weak growth in central cities • In Michigan, strong suburban growth during the 1990s contrasts with particularly weak growth in central cities • Since 1978, there has been a 26 percent increase in urbanized land area. Meanwhile, 18 percent of agricultural land and 8 percent of wetlands have been lost • In the state of Michigan, 364,000 acres of land were developed between 1992 and 1997 • The state ranked ninth in land consumption during this period. Most states that exceeded Michigan had much greater population growth • The average annual conversion of developed land was nearly 60 percent higher in the 1990s than in the 1980s

---

VMT Compared to Population	Increase Between 1992 and 1999:

	In 1992	In 1999
Detroit	8% VMT increase	3% population increase
Lansing	16% VMT increase	2% population increase
Grand Rapids	20% VMT increase	8% population increase

Decentraliz-ation is Costly	Decentralization has had many negative consequences for newer suburban areas: - traffic congestion - loss of open space - air pollution - overcrowded schools

Decentraliz-ation is Costly	Not just a central city problem. Older suburbs are beginning to take on many of the challenges of central cities. • Increasing school poverty • Growing racial and ethnic diversity • Employment is decentralizing. Cities gained jobs during the 1990s, but suburbs gained more • Declining fiscal capacity • Declining commercial corridors and retail malls

Dually Supporting & Under-utilizing Two Systems of Infra-structure	We are dually supporting & under-utilizing two systems of infra-structure: • One being abandoned in and around central cities and close-in suburbs • One that is not yet fully used in rural areas • Causing governments to forgo maintenance of much infrastructure and the provision of anything other than growth related infrastructure

Sprawl Costs Us All	In short, sprawl costs us all: • Direct $ costs to build new infrastructure while costs to maintain existing infrastructure grows • Secondary costs of pollution, declining property values in cities, increasing concentration of poverty • Cumulative impacts on the environment, on renewable natural resources, on generations left behind • Can be separated into various fiscal, economic, environmental, social, and generational impacts

Sprawl Costs Us All, *Continued*

- Most evident in loss of resource based lands (farms and forests) and in congested roads
- If you've been a driver in Michigan for some time, take a drive along a familiar route and you'll likely notice a significant change in the loss of farmland in rural areas.

People LIKE Sprawl

The fundamental problem is that people seem to like sprawl.

The simple antidote to this problem is higher density. We have to start building at a higher density but people don't like higher density.

"The only thing that people dislike more than sprawl is higher density."- Stu Meck, APA

BUT-
"Most of the American public is not unhappy with the current pattern of development in metropolitan areas—it simply can no longer afford it." *Costs of Sprawl-Revisited*, TRB-NRC (1998)

So why do we have sprawl?
Because we allow people to make choices concerning where they choose to live without requiring them to bear the cost or burden of those choices. The exception is, of course, the impoverished, who do not have the same choices.

A primary focus of public policy over the past 35 years has been shifting emphasis on making people bear more of the costs / consequences of their choices.

Solutions

There are simple solutions but they also have some unintended consequences.

These solutions are either:
1. Market-Based (ironic that those who most profess support for market-based solutions to the problem of sprawl adamantly oppose the most effective market-based solutions)
2. Regulatory
3. Public Investment Based

Combinations are NOT simple, but this is the compromise—middle ground—where all the focus is, and is likely to remain so for our lifetime with the added dimension of using incentive-based measures wherever feasible.
- Address all of the direct and measurable uses
- Development community opposed to Market Based solutions
- Public investment based – urban redevelopment / brownfield cleanup scale dozens more than what you see today
- If the community is good, people will want to move and stay there

Market Based Solutions

- Raise the price of gas to $4-5 a gallon and use the money to build and improve/ maintain roads, transit, improve environmental consequences of auto use
- Make all new development pay for all direct public service costs and calculable secondary public service costs (as a form of Impact Fees)
- Could reduce or eliminate many regulations
- These measure are opposed because it is perceived as an additional cost and reducing choice. While all it really does is shift choice and place the costs onto those who create the impacts. This simply ties real consequences to choice.

Regulatory Based Solutions

- Stiff urban growth boundaries around all metro areas
- Mandatory affordable housing requirements
- Strong protection of renewable natural resources
- Stricter environmental regulations
- Strong regional governance structure

Public Investment Based

- Major urban redevelopment initiatives and brownfield cleanup
- Major new transit initiatives
- Major effort to redirect public spending away from greenfields and into existing communities
- Major job creation efforts targeted to existing communities
- Major effort to maintain existing infrastructure instead of building new infrastructure

Key Research   For detailed discussion of the costs of sprawl with a special focus on transportation, a discussion of pros vs. cons, and the benefits of sprawl see the following reports:

- Costs of Sprawl – Revisited, TRB-NRC (1998)
- Costs of Sprawl – 2000, TRB-NRC (2000)

Common Objectives

- Creating livable sustainable communities that people want to live in

- Protecting existing community character, landscapes

- Protecting the environment

- Protecting renewable natural resources

See Vision Statement in Chapter Three of the final MLULC Report at **www.michiganlanduse.org**

Elements Necessary to Achieve these Objectives	- Compact, multi-use development - Open space conservation - Expanded mobility - Enhanced livability - Infill, redevelopment, and adaptive use in built-up areas - Efficient management and expansion of infrastructure
Preservation of Existing Infrastructure Investment	- Hard to do with so many independent decision bodies - Hard to do with sprawl placing so many demands - Hard to do with fiscal resources that grow slower than demand - Hard to do with "preferred land uses" like mobile home parks, schools and now major public buildings - Hard to do with increasing number of private roads versus public roads (caused by serious deficiencies in Land Division Act and Condominium Act) - Essential because *"we can not build our way out of congestion"* - Necessary if we desire to build communities people want to live in - Difficult, because it requires us to value both our urban communities and our renewable natural resources and not just look at "underdeveloped" land as a commodity.
Smart Growth is a Good Place to Start	- Brad to go over Smart Growth Tenets - Why will they help? - By reducing sprawl - By making more livable communities - By more efficiently using fiscal resources available - By maintaining and enhancing the infrastructure we have instead of building new
MLULC Recommendations	- Context sensitive design (Chapter 6, #9a) - New road standards (Chapter 6, 9b) - Higher density and mixed use (Chapter 6, 7 and 25a) - New tools for local governments (Chapter 6, 25b) - Long range infrastructure planning and local CIP are critical (Chapter 6, 25b and Chapter 7, 1, 2, 3 and 4)
We Must Make Choices	We Must Make Choices about How We Spend our Transportation $... We cannot do everything people want. - There are limited resources and we must make choices driven by a common vision not by trends.

- For example, always ensuring the. ease of vehicular travel becomes a secondary objective if our primary objective is building livable, sustainable communities. It doesn't mean one never does so, just not primarily. It means focusing more on transit in urban areas and less on roads.

- That means maintaining and improving what we already have in place must be the top infrastructure priority.

Q & A

Q: Do you see much benefit to the new cluster laws passed?
A: No. Marginal provisions with no incentives to use them. Clustering will lessen sprawl but save only some open space.

Q: Do you see other states having the same problem with sprawl as Michigan is?
A: Michigan may have a slightly larger, faster rate of sprawl right now vs. other states. In Michigan, we allow single family homes in agricultural communities.

Also, every unit of government is allowed to make their own jurisdictions. They are not thinking of the impact or cumulative interest across all units of government.

The Transportation / Land Use Link:
The Smart Growth Alternative

Expert Speaker: **Brad Strader, Partner-in-Charge Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc.**

Land Use Arrange-ment	The link between land use, in terms of transportation, and land use arrangement-
	• Mixed or isolated uses/densities
	• Number & length of vehicle trips
	• Densities to support or not support transit
	• Consideration of road capacity in planning
	Focus on local community perspective:
	• Connection between land use and transportation
	• Choice of what type of land uses a community has
Design Decisions	• Promotion of non-motorized travel
	• Outdated road design standards
	• Access control
	• Decisions made at local level affect transportation system
	• Each county has own standards –
	• Counties don't invite MDOT (Michigan Department of Transportation) to the table
	• Laws are outdated – Oregon can deny a land use change along trunk lines
	• Governors task force – include water and sewer – not roads
	• MDOT community lets this happen
	• Public officials not considering road changes
Low-Density cannot support transit	Isolated Land Uses & No Mode Choices
	• No pathway system
	• Short, Single Purpose & Lengthy Trips by Automobile *Only*
Alternative Arrangement & Systems	• Shorter trips
	• Options for non-motorized travel
	• Possibility of multi-purpose trips
	• Possibility of transit increased

Typical Land-Use Transportation Cycle	New development…
	More traffic/ congestion…
	Improve transportation system…
	Road improvements made, but new land use fills the additional capacity…
	Demand for more intense land use…
	Eventually land uses move outward, capacity left underutilized
	New development….
	…and the cycle continues!

Typical Planning & Development Decisions	In Michigan, typically,
	• Do not consider implications on the transportation system
	• Do not effectively involve MDOT, MPO's, road commissions, or adjacent communities
	• Constrained by law/case law
	• Public officials are unclear about their roles & authority

ITE	Smart Growth Principles:
	Bring transportation need & development into better balance to create livable communities through:
	• Job/work force/housing balance
	• Compact/complementary mix of land uses
	• Building upon existing infrastructure
	• Economic viability
	• Attractive design
	• Environmental sensitivity
	• Choices of travel modes
	• Fiscally sustainable over time
	Michigan forgets roads are part of the infrastructure.
	Michigan does not have a lot of choices for transportation modes – mostly single occupied vehicles.
	Some communities are just beginning to consider roadway capacity in land use.

Smart Growth Land Use Policies	- Consider roadway capacity in land use planning - Arrange land uses to reduce trip lengths - Promote mixed uses to reduce # of trips - Direct development to locations where road capacity exists or where roadway improvements are planned - Density or nodes to support transit
Promote Community-Wide Long Range Land Use & Transportation Plans	1. Collaborative process-MPO, adjacent communities, multi-agency 2. Inventory existing conditions 3. Identify future conditions (including modeling) 4. Evaluate alternatives & recommendations - Land Use Changes, Patterns & Intensity - Transportation Improvements - Public Input - Cost/Funding
Corridor Management Plans & Committees	- Corridor-wide approach to major development proposals - Coordinate access reviews, R.O.W issues & improvement - Promote unified design - Increase funding opportunities - Models: East Beltline, M-59 (Livingston Co.), M-11, West Oakland Corridor, MDOT Access Mgmt. Projects, Orchard Lake Road Committee
Bypasses	- Many under consideration in Michigan - Controversial & expensive - Need often tied to land use decisions - Impact depends upon land use & access controls along new route - Bypasses – 15 or 18 bypasses in the state – created by land use decisions - Bypass – economic impact – sprawl – make effective
Transit Friendly Design	- Density to support mass-transit - Land use patterns - Site Plan Review guidelines - Pathways to adjoining sites - Connections to bus stops For the past 20 years we have not considered transit. Now we want/need it, but it is expensive to retrofit.

Non-Motorized Transportation-Walkable Communities	• Walkable community – less than 1% used by pedestrians • Designs do not emphasize pedestrians • Connection from sidewalks to entrances, for examples • Mixing land uses, for example, connective subdivisions • Street connections – involve local units of government, road commission – no connectivity • Still using outdated road standards – public doesn't want road extended – very controversial
Tools Are Accessible	Lots of tools used at the local units of governments • Traffic impact studies • Sponsor handbook – more and more communities adopting this • Traffic study done – forward to Michigan Department of Transportation • Have a recommended practice and promote it among local officials • Education requirements are continually needed due to local officials changing
Access Management	Way to manages the number, location, spacing, and design of access – use to close driveways that have been problematic • Right-of-way preservation – MDOT sponsored bill – never made it out of committee • Not much cooperation with MDOT at the local level • MDOT will work with the project and develop to buy right of ways (M59 for example)

Context Sensitive Road Design	Need to incorporate a variety of design standards – public is expecting not to have a "one design fits all" community
	• Traffic calming
	  Retains the neighborhood character – slow traffic down in neighborhoods and downtown – local offices don't know how to do it – trying to retrofit it
	• Alternative to additional process
	  Roads build up with traffic – improve traffic system – why does this happen – people like sprawl – when developers are looking to develop – don't' consider traffic – home buyers going out on weekends – don't consider commute and weekday traffic – a lot of attitudes to overcome
	
	Public officials and road officials need to work together, continuous and aggressive education of public officials to work together.

Q & A   [Discussion]
- Education for public officials and land use planners – educating public about true cost of leadership and officials make –
- Perception moving to country to get away from street crime, while in fact, their kids are more likely to be killed in car crash traveling from location to location
- Financial burden of choices
- Tri county regional planning commission – effort towards public education – all levels of government need to do this – attitudes one example schools – educate public – someone else is causing the problem – not a willingness to face who we are – think they aren't part of the problem
- Attitudes have to change amongst everyone
- Traffic impact studies – can study be done before development: can do so if its in the ordinance – denied development – gone to court and courts have denied blocking of development
- Local school district has 3 brand new schools along M36 – school traffic increasing for 16-18 year olds that isn't continuous – structures in place to come together on these issues – but not always used.
- Good examples of communities retrofitting – redevelopment projects are connecting – always a battle to connect subdivision

Land Use / Transportation Issues
In Industrial Development Decision-Making
Expert Speaker: **Ray Tadgerson, President and CEO, Capital Consultants, Inc.**

A Case Study	GM's Decision making process for locating two new assembly plants in the Lansing Region

---

Background	GM's Announcement in 1996 to stop all production of vehicles in Lansing by 2004

Impact of losing the facilities:
- 18,000 lost jobs by 2006
- $900M / year in lost income (U/M Remi Study, June 1999)

The Committee's Reaction- A Blue Ribbon Committee to retain GM. Ray Tadgerson served as the Project Director/Manager for the committee.

Presentation for GM by the Blue Ribbon Committee	The Blue Ribbon Committee and Quick Response Team's message to GM was simple: Regional Focus Team believes that Lansing is a great place to invest, live, work, recreate and raise a family.

Our Objective	To convince GM to stay or build new here by addressing their concerns and needs, thereby facilitating a positive outcome within their decision making process.

The Key Factors Important to GM	

- Recent GM Supplier investments in Lansing Region: $279 M in 1990s
- Regional Auto Industry Partners: 20+ by 1998
- Regional Economic Highlights
- Labor Force and Training
- Worker's Compensation Issues
- Healthcare Costs
- Quality of Life
- Pro-Business Government
- Special Regional Partnerships with GM
- Site Options

Site Options	Original Focus – priority order for the Blue Ribbon Committee

- GM Plant 1 Site
- Brownfield in City
- Greenfield in City
- Greenfield in Region

Site Options, *Continued*	Current Focus- revised priority • GM Plant 1 Site • Greenfield in Region

Site Options-Assumptions	Footprint used from Brazil – came across by accident. Blue Macaw model would actually work – 77 acres – 188 acres for GM 1 plant site – GM to reuse existing property – by our actions as a community that brought this to their attention and made it happen: • The Blue Macaw footprint has been utilized for both Epsilon and Delta Production Lines • Where both Epsilon and Delta lines are on the same sites, two separate footprints were utilized to illustrate potential space requirements • GM may utilize a different footprint (Eisenach) for either Epsilon or Delta or combine them in a multi-line facility • If GM abandons the Plant 1 Assembly Plant or Plant 6 Body Plant, rehabilitation of these sites will be required • UAW issues and concerns are not addressed within this presentation

Important Key Site Selection Elements	• Preferred use of existing GM sites specifically including Brownfields • Environmental concerns • Utilities with adequate capacities • Ease of access to Interstate highways for GM and Suppliers with adequate Trunklines • Rail Access

Site One: Result	New Cadillac facility on existing Brownfield

The Second Site – An Equally Great Challenge	GM wanted 1000 acres of land assemblage with: • Utility access and capacity • Access to Trunklines and Interstate highways • Rail Access • Environmental Concerns

Site Two: Result	• New $200M Regional Stamping Facility • New $1.0B Assembly Facility scheduled to begin construction early next year (2004) • New SSR Assembly in Lansing Township

Impact   By 2020,

- 18,000 new jobs created in the region
- 49,000 new jobs state-wide, of which 70% will be Non-Manufacturing
- $10.8B (1999 dollars) gain from 2000 to 2020 in inflation-adjusted personal income
- $38.6B gain in Michigan

Conclusion   Land use and transportation issues are critical elements in industrial decision making.

**A Success
Story…**   A story of collaboration between:
- City of Lansing
- Delta Township
- Lansing Township
- General Motors
- United Auto Workers
- Michigan Economic Development Corporation
- Michigan Department of Transportation
- Eaton County Road Commission
- Eaton County Drain Commission

Among hundreds of others….

Q & A   Q: Was public transportation part of this evaluation?
                  A: Yes, it was a major part. Construction workers parked in downtown Lansing and shuttled back and forth, however, the long term was not a major discussion.

                  Another big part of the problem is, if gas prices were raised truckers would go somewhere else – along with the industries.

Transportation's Impact on the
Michigan Land Use Leadership Council (MLULC)
Expert Speaker: **Hans Voss, Executive Director, Michigan Land Use Institute**

Background of the MLULC

On February 5, 2003, Governor Jennifer Granholm announced the formation of a bipartisan Michigan Land Use Leadership Council.

In an effort to preserve the character of Michigan, this 26-member council was charged with addressing the trends, causes, and consequences of unmanaged growth and development in Michigan (Executive Order 2003-4). The council provided more than 150 recommendations to the governor and the legislature designed to minimize the impact of current land use trends on Michigan's environment and economy.

Top Ten Priorities of the MLULC

In its report released in August 2003, the MLULC identified the following ten priorities, along with its recommendations:

1. Establish State Land Use Goals for Michigan
2. Direct Public Expenditures in Cities and Already Developed Areas
3. Create Market Rate and Affordable Housing Options in Urban and Rural Areas
4. Promote Viable and Value-Added Agriculture
5. Establish Commerce Centers
6. Embrace Regional Planning as a Tool to Halt Sprawl
7. Adopt Concurrency Tools for Local Governments
8. Improve Local Infrastructure Decisions to Achieve Smart Growth
9. Improve Public Transit
10. Establish Context-Sensitive Design Rules for Michigan Department of Transportation, Road Commissions, and Local Communities

To help you research these topics, specific citations are available in the sections below. Please refer to the cited page numbers and sections of the *Michigan's Land, Michigan's Future* report available online at http://www.michiganlanduse.org/

Establish State Land Use Goals for Michigan

- From Recommendation 12, p.61, Planning and Development Regulation:

Establishment of state land use goals for Michigan. The state should establish broad-based, visionary land use goals for Michigan that incorporate the vision and goals as defined in Chapter 3 of this report. [Reservations: Rep. R. Johnson; Objections: R. Jones, M. McGraw]

Direct Public Expenditures

In Cities & Already Developed Areas:
- See Recommendation 1, p. 32, Urban Revitalization
- See Recommendation 1, p. 70, Infrastructure and Community Services

Create Market Rate & Affordable Housing Options in Urban and Rural Areas	• From Recommendation 3d, p.36, Urban Revitalization: **Establish a Michigan Housing and Community Development Trust Fund to make grants to for-profit and nonprofit developers that agree to develop mixed-income rental.**
Promote Viable, Value-Added Agriculture	• See Recommendation 6, p.46, Land Resource-Based Industries
Establish Commerce Centers	• See Recommendation 5, p.37 Urban Revitalization
Embrace Regional Planning as a Tool to Halt Sprawl	• See Recommendation 21, p.62, Planning and Development Regulation
Adopt Concurrency Tools for Local Governments	• See Recommendation 25b (2), p.66, Planning and Development Regulation
Improve Local Infrastructure Decisions to Achieve Smart Growth	• See Recommendation 3, p.72, Infrastructure and Community Services
Improve Public Transit	• See Recommendation 4, p.73, Infrastructure and Community Services

Establish Context-Sensitive Design Rules for MDOT, Road Commissions, Local Communities	• See Recommendation 9a and 9b, pp.59-60, Infrastructure and Community Services

Context-Sensitive Design (CSD)	The Goal of Context-Sensitive Design (CSD) is to introduce flexibility to the road design process so that factors such as the character of the local community, impacts to the environmental, historic, scenic, and aesthetic resources, and access by pedestrians and bikers, are held to be just as important as the traditional road design factors.

The Federal Highway Administration's definition of context-sensitive design (CSD):

> a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic, and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility. CSD is an approach that considers the total context within which a transportation improvement project will exist. |

Three Main Elements of CSD	1. Continued treatment of safety, mobility and planning for the future as critical factors in road design
2. The consideration, as equally important criteria, of various factors related to the location where the project will be, including:
a. The character of the community
b. Minimization of harm to the environmental, historic, scenic and aesthetic resources
c. Where possible, easy access by pedestrians and bicycles
3. Opportunity for early and meaningful public participation to ensure that the state transportation agency truly understands the local community and the impacts any project would have on the community

A Short History of CSD	Federal law has been amended to permit states to use context-sensitive design in designing federally funded road projects. That approach began to change in 1991 with two provisions of the ISTEA legislation:
1. ISTEA provided that federally funded projects that are not on the National Highway System could be designed to state design standards. 23 U.S.C. § 109 (o).

2. ISTEA provided that "if a proposed project…involves a historic facility or is located in an area of historic or scenic value, the Secretary may approve such project notwithstanding [other applicable design standards] if such project is designed to standards that allow for the preservation of such historic or scenic values and such project is designed with mitigation measures to allow preservation of such value and ensure safe use of the facility." Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, § 1016, Pub. L. 102-240, 105 Stat. 1914.

Current Approaches to CSD at the State Level	New Jersey, Connecticut, Vermont, California, Rhode Island, and Maine have adopted various progressive approaches, alternative design standards, or planning techniques at the state level.
Michigan Land Use Leadership Council Recommendations	**Community Design.** A variety of approaches are suggested to enhance existing efforts to improve community design. a) The state shall adopt context-sensitive design rules (character of the roadway designed is related to the character of the location receiving it) for state highways where safe and appropriate, to help ensure that new or expanded roads do not detract from the environment or community design. [Objections: B. Warner] b) The state should authorize and strongly encourage the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), County Road Commissions, and Local Communities to use alternative road design standards where safe and otherwise appropriate, including context-sensitive design rules that minimize environmental and community character impacts. These standards would include but are not limited to: 1) Standards for narrower width residential roads and rights-of-way serving residential developments, including associated standards that address grades, curves, landscaping in road rights-of-way, and similar design features 2) Flexible alternative design standards for public roads, bridges, and rights-of-way that take into account their use and scenic character and include options such as narrower lanes, reduced speeds, and other alternatives 3) Protection form liability for road authorities that authorize use of narrower than current standard width public roads and rights-of-way including associated standards that address grades, curves, landscaping in road rights-of-way, and similar design features
Q & A	Q: Do you know of any instances where CSD has not met federal funding standards? A: It's in the directions provided by the Federal Highways administration. No, I am not aware of any.